

**REMARKS**

This paper is responsive to an *Official Action* that issued in this case on January 22, 2008. In that Action, the Examiner withdrew the finality of the previous *Action* and withdrew the indicated allowability of claims 10-20 in view of a newly discovered reference. The status of the claims is:

- Claims 1-6 are allowed.
- Claims 7, 10, 11, 17, 18, 21, and 29 are rejected.
- Claims 8, 9, 12-16, 19, 20, 24-28, 30, and 31 are objected to.

Responsive to the *Action*, claims 7, 8, 10, 12, 15, 16, 21, and 26 are hereby amended. Reconsideration is requested in view of the foregoing amendments and the following comments.

Claims 7, 10, and 21 are now  
in Condition for Allowance

The Examiner rejected independent claims 7, 10, and 21 under Section 103 as being obvious over U.S. Pat. No. 6,240,477 to Erkinger in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,839,776 to Kaysen.

Independent claims 7, 10, and 21 have been amended to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the inventive subject matter. Specifically, these claims have been amended to recite that:

said first adapter and said second adapter are physically connected to one another.
---

This limitation is not disclosed or otherwise suggested by the cited art. Erkinger, which is unrelated to the claimed subject matter, discloses a variety of *electrical* connections between a data bus device in a TV and a data bus device in a PC. Kaysen, which discloses information that is relevant to the claimed subject matter, pertains to authenticating peripherals using a predetermined code.

There is no reason to modify Erkinger by Kaysen. Furthermore, and just as significantly, the proposed modification would not yield the claimed invention. As a consequence, amended claims 7, 10, and 21 are allowable over the combination of Erkinger and Kaysen.

Claims 11, 13, 14, 17-20,  
24, 25, and 27-31 are now  
in Condition for Allowance

Claims 11, 13, 14, and 17-20 are allowable based on their dependence on allowable base claim 10. Similarly, claims 24, 25, and 27-31 are allowable based on their dependence on allowable base claim 21. Also, the recitation of additional patentable features in the dependent claims provides a secondary basis for their patentability.

Claims 8, 12, and 26 are now  
in Condition for Allowance

The Examiner indicated that claims 8, 12, and 26 (among other claims) would be allowable if rewritten to incorporate all limitations of their respective base claims and any intervening claims. These claims have been so amended.

In particular, the limitations of claim 7 have been added to claim 8, which is now an independent claim. As a consequence, claim 8 should now be in condition for allowance.

The limitations of claim 10 have been added to claim 12, which is now an independent claim. As a consequence, claim 12 should now be in condition for allowance.

The limitations of claim 21 have been added to claim 26, which is now an independent claim. As a consequence of this amendment, claim 26 is believed to be in condition for allowance.

Claims 9, 15, and 16 are now  
in Condition for Allowance

Claim 9 is dependent on claim 8, which is now believed to be allowable. This should place claim 9 in condition for allowance as well.

Claims 15 and 16 are dependent on claim 12, which is now believed to be allowable. This dependency should, therefore, place claims 15 and 16 in condition for allowance.

Conclusion

It is believed that claims 1-21 and 24-31 now presented for examination are in condition for allowance. A notice to that effect is solicited.

Respectfully,  
Robert James Howard et al.

By **/Wayne S. Breyer/**  
Wayne S. Breyer  
Reg. No. 38,089  
Attorney for Applicants  
732-578-0103 x12

DeMont & Breyer, L.L.C.  
Suite 250  
100 Commons Way  
Holmdel, NJ 07733  
United States of America